



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/678,163	10/02/2000	Jerry D. Kline	1303-1008	4116
7590	02/24/2004			EXAMINER
Lawrence R Youst Smith Danamraj & Youst PC 12900 Preston Road Suite LB 15 Dallas, TX 75230-1328			LEE, HSIEN MING	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2823	
DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/678,163	KLINE, JERRY D., Hsien-Ming Lee	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 December 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 36 and 41 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 37-40 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some \* c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a)  The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                             | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                    | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION*****Remarks***

1. The double patenting rejection is withdrawn.
2. Claims 1-41 are pending in the application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 36 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Khandros et al.(US 6,372,527).

In re claim 36, Khandros et al. teach the claimed matched set of integrated circuit chips comprising:

- a first chip assembly 928/942 diced from a wafer-interposer assembly (Fig.31), the first chip assembly 928/942 including a first integrated circuit chip 928 from a wafer;
- second chip assembly 928/942 diced from the wafer-interposer assembly, the second chip assembly 928/942 including a second integrated circuit chip 928 from the wafer, the first and second integrated circuit chips 928 being previously simultaneously tested (col. 15, lines 28-32); and
- a substrate 930 onto which the first and second chip assemblies 928/942 are electrically coupled (Fig.13 and col. 15, lines 28-32).

Khandros et al. do not expressly teach that the simultaneously tested is to determine inclusion in the matched set as part of the wafer-interposer assembly.

However, Khandros et al. do suggest that with the simultaneously testing, as shown in Fig.13, it would able to determine defects in the chips (col. 15, lines 28-32).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to recognize that the purpose of the simultaneously testing can be interpreted as “determine inclusion in the matched set as part of the wafer-interposer assembly” because it determine defects in the chips.

In re claim 41, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to recognize that the method of Khandros et al. can be applied to multiple chip assembly situation, as many as three (Figs. 31-33).

#### ***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claims 1-35 is allowed.
6. Claims 37-40 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
7. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record neither teaches nor suggests electrically and mechanically coupling a semiconductor wafer having a plurality of integrated circuit chips to *an interposer* to form a wafer-interposer assembly; *selecting* at least two of the chip assemblies corresponding to the at least two of the integrated circuit chips *determined for inclusion in the matched set based upon the simultaneously testing*; and *sorting* the chip assemblies *based upon the inclusion*

Art Unit: 2823

*determinations performed during the simultaneously testing of the pairs of the integrated circuit chips.*

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hsien-Ming Lee whose telephone number is 571-272-1863. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:00 ~ 5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri can be reached on 571-272-1855. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hsien-Ming Lee  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2823

Feb. 20, 2004

